IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
WESTERN DIVISION

JUNNE KOH, #44827-086   PLAINTIFF

VERSUS   CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:17-cv-50-DCB-MTP

WARDEN "Unknown" STONE, et al.   DEFENDANTS

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion [19] for Reconsideration of the

Court's Order [15] entered November 21, 2017.   That Order [15] denied Plaintiff's Motion [14]

requesting that the Court allow Plaintiff to include a *Bivens* claim in the instant civil action.   *See*

Order [15] at 1-2.   For the reasons discussed herein, the Court will deny Plaintiff's Motion [19].

An interlocutory order, such as the Order at issue here, "may be revised at any time before

the entry of a judgment adjudicating all the claims and all the parties' rights and liabilities."

See Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b).   Rule 54(b) provides the Court with the inherent power to "reconsider

and reverse its prior rulings on any interlocutory order 'for any reason it deems sufficient.'"

United States v. Renda, 709 F.3d 472, 479 (5th Cir. 2013) (quoting *Saqui v. Pride Cent. Am.,*

LLC, 595 F.3d 206, 210-11 (5th Cir. 2010).   Such authority, however, "is exercised sparingly in

order to forestall the perpetual reexamination of orders and the resulting burdens and delays."

Castrillo v. Am. Home Mortg. Servicing, Inc., No. 09-4369, 2010 WL 1424398, at *3 (E.D. La.

Apr. 5, 2010) (citations omitted).

Plaintiff argues that the ruling by the United States Supreme Court in *Minneci v. Pollard*,

565 U.S. 118 (2012) is "ridiculous and unjust in the light of common sense."   Pl.'s Mot. [19]

at 1.   Plaintiff further argues that "[t]his infamous doctrine should be reversed by another

Supreme Court." *Id.* Plaintiff's arguments are without merit. The Court's decision in the

Order [15] entered on November 21, 2017, was correct. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that Plaintiff's Motion [19] is **DENIED.**

SO ORDERED, this the 19th day of December, 2017.

s/David Bramlette
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE